

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JOE HOWARD PAYNE,

and

BRUCE DWAYNE WINSTON,

Defendants.

CRIMINAL NO. RDB-13-0639

...o0o...

**GOVERNMENT’S RESPONSE TO  
JOE HOWARD PAYNE’S “SUPPLEMENT TO MOTIONS FILED”**

In today’s supplemental filing, Payne quotes the following passage from page 16 of the government’s consolidated motions response:

“[T]he government is not aware of, and does not intend to introduce at trial, any statements made by Payne **prior to** the commencement of the canine sniff and vehicle search.”

Dkt. No. 129 at 1 (quoting Dkt. No. 54 at 16) (emphasis added).

With apologies for the confusion, the government wishes to clarify that the words “**prior to**” in the passage excerpted above should be replaced with “**after**.” In drafting the excerpted sentence, undersigned counsel meant to convey that Payne’s argument regarding the supposedly tainting effect of the canine sniff and vehicle search applies only to statements made after those events took place. The insertion of “**prior to**” rather than “**after**” is nothing more than a typo, attributable to undersigned counsel’s momentary bout of conceptual dyslexia.

To be clear, then, the government **is** aware of, and **does** plan to introduce at trial, statements made by Payne to MSP officers **prior to** the canine sniff and vehicle search. From



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2014, I caused a copy of the foregoing Response to be served on defense counsel via the Court's electronic filing system.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Peter J. Martinez  
Assistant United States Attorney